DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 436 JC 920 117

AUTHOR Pardee, Ronald L.
TITLE A Descriptive Profile of Returning Students, and the Influences Affecting the Re-Enrollment in College.
PUB DATE 12 Mar 92
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Research Conference of the Community College League (Arrowhead, CA, March 12, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Attendance; Community Colleges; Dropout Research; *Enrollment Influences; Enrollment Trends; Questionnaires; *Reentry Students; School Holding Power; *Stopouts; *Student Characteristics; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted at a medium-sized California community college to identify the characteristics of students who had previously dropped out of college and then returned to the community college and the influences on their decision to re-enroll for college credit. Surveys were mailed to 396 stopouts, asking them to rate the significance of various factors to their decision to return to college, to identify the one or two events that triggered their decision at the specific time, and to provide information on their personal decisions. Study findings included the following: (1) the typical returning student was a white female between the ages of 28 and 32, taking less than six units during the evening and working in excess of 40 hours per week; (2) 30% of the students had been out of school for 5 years or longer, 23.7% for 1 year, and 10% for 2 to 3 years; (3) "desire to learn" was the most important influence to return to college for both men and women and for all ethnic groups, except black students; (4) other significant influences were "improved earning potential," "increased value on education," "improved emotional outlook," "occupation requires," and "dissatisfaction with job"; (5) the six top-ranked influences corresponded closely to the top-ranked "trigger" influences; and (6) 73% were returning to the college they had left originally. A literature review, the survey instrument, and a 119-item bibliography are included. (AC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342436

Community College League
Annual Research Conference

Arrowhead 1992

Conference Presentation

A Descriptive Profile of Returning Students, and the Influences Affecting the Re-enrollment in College

March 12, 1992

Arrowhead, California

Presented by:

Dr. Ronald L. Pardee

Riverside Community College

JC920117

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. L. Pardee

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Descriptive Profile of Returning Students, and
the Influences Affecting the Re-enrollment of Students
in a California Community College

by Ronald L. Pardee, Ed.D.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe the returning student and then identify the influences present when "stopout" students re-enroll in community college credit coursework.

Procedure: This was a descriptive research study which surveyed three hundred ninety six students who had dropped out of college and then returned to the community college. Chi Square and lambda statistical tests were used to determine significant differences among demographic categories.

Findings: The summary profile of returning students showed that the typical student was a white female between the ages of 28 and 32 taking less than six units during the evening. This profile also indicated that the returning student was working in excess of forty hours per week and received no educational assistance from their employer. While the typical length of time out of school was over five years, there is an important "window of opportunity" to influence dropouts to return to college, of under two years. The "desire to learn" was the most important influence to return to college for both men and women and all ethnic categories except black students. Five other significant influences to return to college were: Improved Earning Potential, Increased Value on Education, Improved Emotional Outlook, Occupation Requires, and Dissatisfaction with Job. Most returning students were returning to the college they originally left. The distinction between longer range, more enduring influences to return to college and a more immediate "trigger" event influencing the decision to return could not be made.

Conclusions: The primary influencing factors to return to college could be considered intrinsic in nature. There is a significant "hidden" student body and the most important pool from which to attract returning students is that of former students of your own institution. In order to enable returning students to take more units in a semester and progress more rapidly towards graduation, their work load will need to be reduced and employer provided educational assistance will be necessary. Further study is needed to distinguish between the more enduring influences and triggers. Additional study is needed at more ethnically diverse campuses to determine more reliable data for minority populations.

Speeches
Disabstr

A Descriptive Profile of Returning Students, and the Influences Affecting the Re-enrollment in College

Introduction

In the long run, stopout students continue to aspire toward a degree after leaving college the first, or even second time. (Eckland 1964, 420) The intention of men and women to resume their college education is evidenced by their enduring commitment to the pursuit, yet unfilled, of a college degree. (Smart & Pascarella 1987, 317)

Statements such as these indicate the importance of studying reentry into higher education as a function of student retention. This study explored several characteristic areas of returning students. The first area was a summary description of returning students at a medium-sized California community college. The second area was the influences present when students decided to return to college, and the third area was which of those influences acted as actual triggers to cause the student to return.

College dropouts are considered by many to be failures: a failure to themselves and a failure on the part of the educational system. Statisticians and admissions offices easily track those students who enter college immediately after completing high school, progress through the Baccalaureate degree in four years and graduate.

Research has shown that this continuous pattern for acquiring a degree is not the norm, yet we still study retention rates in comparison to this outdated standard.

When only 40 percent of college graduates complete their degrees within the traditional four years, and 70 percent return to finish their degrees at some later date, (LeBlanc 1986, 36) the importance of recognizing that most dropouts are really stopouts becomes apparent. This study identified the characteristics of students who stopped attending college and then returned at some later date.

In this paper, the conclusions of the study, its implications, and suggestions for further research will be discussed.

Conclusions

The summary profile of returning students at this medium sized California community college shows that the typical returning student is a white female between the ages of 28 and 32 taking less than six units during the evening and living within ten miles of the campus. This profile also indicates that the returning student has been away from college over five years, works in the clerical field an excess of forty hours per week, and receives no educational assistance from her employer. Her place of employment is typically less than five miles from the campus of attendance. The most common influencing factor to return to college is the desire to learn, and it also acts as the trigger influence to cause the return to college. This

profile is very close to the age, sex and ethnicity distribution of the general campus population, which indicates that the returning student is very typically representative of the this population.

The sample population indicated that 73.1 percent had previously attended the institution studied and were returning to continue their education. This extremely high return rate of students to their "home" school is indicative of the need to implement recruiting efforts of students who have withdrawn from college. The greatest return on effort would seem to be from recruiting stopout students from the home institution within two years of the time of withdrawal. From the standpoint of lost human potential, this timely response should also lessen the negative effects of college withdrawal.

The number of units in which the surveyed students enrolled breaks down as follows: 41.7 percent were enrolled in less than six units, 36.1 percent were enrolled in six to eleven units, and only 21.7 percent enrolled in twelve or more units. This data becomes significant when compared to the fact that 31.8 percent of the returning students worked in excess of forty hours per week and 21.2 percent worked thirty-one to forty hours per week. Only 9.6 percent of those surveyed were working less than twenty hours per week. The relationship of these two variables indicates there is a strong commitment on the part of returning students to

continue their education even when they can only attend at a rate of less than six units per term.

Knowing that the sixty units required for graduation would necessitate ten semesters of attendance to obtain an Associate degree did not deter the stopout student. Persistence has to be redefined where the stopout is concerned.

It is surprising to consider that such a large number of returning students were working such long hours weekly, and that 34.1 percent were enrolled in daytime only classes. Many of those students are working at night. The evening only students comprised 46.2 percent of the sample population and 8.3 percent were represented in the weekend only category.

Distance from the student's home to campus did not surface as a strong influence nor as a trigger to return to college. Nearly 75 percent of the returning students lived within fifteen miles of the main campus. Even the next category of 16-20 miles from that campus had fewer than half as many respondents as the 11-15 mile category, again reinforcing the concept of higher participation rates for "local" colleges.

As would be expected, the majority of returning students did not hold any college degree. Only 22.8 percent of the returning students held an Associate degree or higher. The degree holding returning students could be

developed as a target audience for job upgrade and professional development coursework.

The largest category for time elapsed between the time stopout students dropped out of college and returned was over five years (30.1 percent), and the next largest category was a single year category of less than one year (23.7 percent). The third and fourth largest categories of one to two years (22.7 percent) and two to three years (10.1 percent), which were also single year categories, showed students have a very strong interest in returning to college shortly after dropping out.

It appears that the underlying reason that an absence of over five years had the largest response rate is that it includes any period of time in excess of five years, and is, therefore, the largest category. The actual tendency is to return to college very shortly after stopping out. Although the time lapse of over 5 years since last attending college is the most frequent category, there appears to be a distinct "window of opportunity" to return during the first two years of absence.

Only 27.8 percent of the returning students surveyed were not employed; 31.8 percent of those employed worked in excess of 40 hours per week, which was the single largest category. Those working from 31 to 40 hours per week comprised 21.2 percent of the sample population, making this the third largest category. Only 19.2 percent of the working students worked less than 30 hours per week.

Job classifications were categorized in seven areas with Other being the largest reported category. After reviewing the written descriptions of job titles included in the questionnaire, most Other job classifications were reclassified as Service occupations. A review of the classification Professional, which ranked as the fourth largest, showed only thirteen respondents held advanced degrees. Clearly the title of Professional was misunderstood and many more respondents classified themselves as Professionals than could be justified by a more traditional definition of the title.

Educational assistance was not provided to respondents by 53.3 percent of their employers. When educational assistance was provided, the most common type was tuition reimbursement (17.2 percent) and the second largest type of assistance was time off to attend class (13.3 percent). While some employers provided multiple types of educational assistance, it was clear that most returning students were not influenced to return to school because of assistance available from their employers. Educational assistance did not appear to be a determining factor when deciding to return to school. There appeared to be economic necessity for returning students to work full time and go to school part time, with most students both living and working very close to the campus of attendance. This finding strengthens the argument for the increased need of more colleges in California.

The respondents were asked to rate nineteen factors on what influence they had on the decision to return to college. From those factors, the respondents were asked to identify the influences which actually triggered them to return when they did.

The six top ranked influences to return to college corresponded closely to the six top ranked triggers to return to college. The Desire to Learn was ranked as the first influence and the first trigger, however black respondents indicated this influence was not a trigger to return. Increased Earning Potential ranked second. Increased Value of Education ranked third, both as an influence and as a trigger. Improved Emotional Outlook ranked fourth as an influence, and ranked sixth as a trigger. Occupation Requires More Education ranked fifth as both an influence and as a trigger. The sixth ranking influence was Dissatisfaction with Job, which ranked fourth as a trigger.

Due to the nearly identical ranking of influences and triggers, the researcher believes that the respondents had an inadequate understanding of the distinction between influences and triggers. With the lack of a time activated cause being identified, the trigger concept can not be substantiated.

It is noteworthy that the second ranked influence and trigger was Increased Earning Potential, yet only 3.9 percent of the employers provided salary reclassification as

an educational assistance. It could therefore be implied that most returning students would find it necessary to change jobs or occupations in order to realize their goal of increased earnings.

Four of the top six ranking influences could be considered intrinsic in nature, which supports Fredrick Herzberg's theory that intrinsic factors provide the greatest motivation. These four are: Desire to Learn; Value on Education; Dissatisfaction with Job; and Improved Emotional Outlook. Unfortunately, these influences are the most difficult to artificially induce, but can be tapped through innovative enrollment service outreach efforts. It is important to note however, that the second ranked trigger, Increased Earning Potential, is an extrinsic factor which can be induced through institutional efforts.

Smart and Pascaralla's causal model also shows a predominance of intrinsic factors influencing the intention to return to college. Dean and Eriksen findings in 1984 showed similar results, which supported the 1983 Mishler study. These findings in regard to intrinsic and extrinsic factors were very supportive of Wolfgang and Dowling's study of 1981.

When the major influences were compared by Sex, the only significant finding was more women than expected indicated an Improved Emotional Outlook triggered their return to college. This finding supported one of the researcher's initial discoveries. While interviewing

reentry students in the development of the survey instrument, it was reported that Improved Emotional Outlook would play a heavy role in causing women to return to college.

When comparing major influences by Age, Value on Education was cited as the trigger to return to college more frequently than was expected in the eighteen to twenty-seven year age group. In the thirty-eight and over age group, it was cited as a trigger less frequently than was expected. With the average age of college students increasing, this information could prove to be important to college admissions procedures when trying to attract younger students to return to college.

More respondents than expected in the twenty-eight to thirty-seven year age category reported Dissatisfaction with Job was the trigger influence to return to college, and fewer than expected in the thirty-eight and over category reported Dissatisfaction as their influencing trigger. This data has implications for employers as well as for college admissions offices, since the implication is that employees are returning to college in order to better prepare themselves for different employment opportunities.

No statistically significant trigger influences were revealed when compared by Ethnicity. There did, however, appear to be a difference in the responses given by the black population. The triggers, "Desire to Learn", "Value on Education", and "Dissatisfied with Job" had a lower than

typical response from the black population when compared to the remaining ethnic populations. This indicates further study of black returning students is justified and is a weakness of the population surveyed.

When comparing the major influences to Attendance Before at the institution studied, a statistically significant difference was seen in Occupation Requires More College. Fewer than expected of the respondents who had previously attended this institution indicated their occupations required more college. It has been previously reported that the tendency of the population surveyed was to return to college a short time after dropping out. Perhaps the fact that their job does not require further education is a reflection of the brief time they have been absent from college.

When the major trigger influences were compared to Attendance Classification, evening and weekend students reported that the Desire to Learn was a stronger trigger for them than it was for day students. This is probably more representative of the "typical" stopout because the evening and weekend attendance classifications better fit the profile of returning students.

The major trigger influences compared to Job Classification revealed that fewer than expected clerical, laborer & craftsmen and sales people indicated the Desire to Learn was a trigger influence causing them to return to college. More than were expected of the technical job

classification said that Desire to Learn was the major trigger. This creates questions that need further study in the face of technological advances expected in the next decade, particularly if community colleges strive to improve the global competitiveness of American technology, as well as further study relating the type of motivation to job classifications.

The comparison of Attendance Before at the community college studied to Job Classification showed that more clerical than were expected had previously attended that institution. When Attendance Classification was compared to Attendance Before at the institution studied, it showed that more weekend students than were expected had not attended the institution before. The students who reported attending both day and evening indicated they had attended the institution before more frequently than was expected.

Comparison of Student Status to Attendance Before at the institution studied showed that more students than expected of the six to eleven unit category had previously attended this institution while more than expected of the under six unit category had not. Former students of the institution studies were likely to have taken more units than did returning students who had previously attended other colleges. This finding would serve as a topic for further study, to determine if students returning to their original school consistently enroll in more units than students returning to college from a different institution.

When comparing Ethnicity to Age, there were more blacks than expected in the thirty-eight and over category, more latinos than expected in the twenty-eight to thirty-seven category, and more of the classification Other than were expected were in the eighteen to twenty-seven age category. There were fewer than expected blacks in the eighteen to twenty-seven category as well as fewer than expected latinos in the eighteen to twenty-seven and over thirty-eight categories. This data are weak when taking into consideration the very low number of non-white respondents.

The comparison of Ethnicity to Attendance Before at the institution studied showed than fewer blacks had attended this institution before than was expected. This, as well as all other ethnicity comparisons, is weak because of the small ethnic population base.

Relationship of Findings to Literature

Literature reviewed in Chapter II suggested that the college dropout rate is an over exaggerated problem and that over a longer period of time, many dropouts return to college, thus becoming stopouts. Based on that view, this study researched the profile of returning students and the influences that aided them in making the decision to return to college. Results of this research show that the most common influences to return to college are in line with the intrinsic motivation evidence found in other studies, with

the exception of the number two ranking factor which is extrinsic. The extrinsic and intrinsic classification of variables in this study support Wolfgang and Dowling's 1981 findings which stated that returning students are motivated more by cognitive interests (learning for its own sake) than by external expectations. The findings of this study are also similar to the Smart and Pascarella study which found that intrinsic satisfaction has a positive influence on the intention to resume college. The "personal enrichment" factor was rated by returning students in the 1984 Blanshan study as the number one factor affecting their decision to return to school. That, too, agrees with the findings in this study. Dean and Eriksen (1984) called this intrinsic motivation "pressure from within". "Pressure from the environment" represents extrinsic motivational factors. Even though two-thirds of the top six triggers are intrinsic, the number two ranked trigger in this study was extrinsic in nature. This is an important distinction which is not consistent with the previously cited literature and justifies further study.

The Blanshan study in 1984 was conducted at a university and showed results comparable to this study in the gender distribution of returning students, but found that far more (53 percent) of the returning students were considered full-time students, compared to only 21.7 percent in this study. This study showed similar findings to Blanshan in that 41 percent of the returning students in her

study worked full-time and up to 52 percent of the returning students in this research were reported as working full-time. The results are even closer when the 72 percent rate of working students is compared to the 76 percent rate found by Blanshan. Astin (1975) and Booth (1987) agree that working full-time has become a necessity for tens of thousands of college students.

The Spanard Model (1987) is based on changes in a student's life which create the opportunity to reenter higher education while maintaining other "life" obligations. Findings from this study agreed with the general statements of Roueche and Sheldon, indicating that continuing education requires balancing academic, work and personal demands.

This study is in line with Van Hook's statement that persisters could be more accurately defined as students who eventually graduate. Eckland's 1964 study and Ramist's findings in 1981 indicated that a majority of dropout students return to college within ten years after matriculation. This has again proven to hold true, and supports Eagle's and Kline's description of college attendance.

Tichenor's theory of an "invisible" student body is verified by this study, which has shown that many students drop out of college and return to continue their education.

All of these studies concerning the "invisible" student body are upheld by Morris (1988) and Head (1989)

when they said there appears to be a large community college student body that consists of stopout students.

Implications for Actions

Being able to accurately assess the influences and triggers which cause dropout students to return to college clearly offers a potential benefit to an institution's welfare. By studying the returning student, the institution can develop a profile of the stopout who has returned to college.

Information found in this study assisted in developing a case study on student retention by Harvard University, and laid the foundation for institutional changes. Institutional changes that have already been made using information found in this study, include the creation of an Office of Vocational Outreach and the sending of letters to selected vocational students during the first semester of their absence, encouraging them to return and finish the necessary coursework for program completion. Letters of encouragement were sent to non-returning students for the four consecutive semesters following the completion of this study. Nearly 700 letters were sent to students each semester following their first semester of absence. The letters were focused on the declared majors of the non-returning students. Twelve majors were included in the pilot program. Faculty in all programs reported a positive response from students and verified that many students were

influenced to return as a result of these letters. Continuation of this effort and the permanent staff to support such a program would very likely noticeably improve completion rates of stopout students. This effort was discussed in a 1990 case study for Harvard College.

The profile of returning students clearly shows that a large number of day students are also returning students and the vast majority of all classifications of evening, weekend and satellite students are returning students. Services provided to these returning students must be tailored to their needs, rather than only being available to meet the needs of newly enrolled students.

A significant finding is that a large number of the returning population (73.1 percent) had previously attended the institution studied. The most significant recruiting efforts in any area should, therefore, be geared toward recruiting former students for two reasons. First, the college has their name, address, phone number and academic history which will facilitate contacting and advising these students. Second, these students have already experienced the initial application, admission and registration process at that institution, therefore, enrolling in classes is much easier for them than for a first time student. A college success course, which could be packaged as an extended orientation program, could and should be tailored to the specific needs and interests of returning students. If a course announcement and description of such a college

success course were included in all correspondence to dropout students, they may be influenced to return to college.

Institutional efforts to increase the number of units in which each student is enrolled must include employer participation. Consider that nearly 32 percent of the returning students were working in excess of 40 hours per week. The only way to increase the number of units these individual students carry requires employer involvement, which can take the form of adjusting their working hours, providing educational assistance or reducing the number of hours worked weekly.

Outreach efforts in this area have been institutionalized at western Riverside county's largest private employer, as a direct result of the information gained from this study. The employer has developed and adopted a new policy through union and management agreement, to adjust schedules of hourly workers to accommodate employees who enroll in college coursework at the college studied. This success can be replicated at many places of employment through positive recognition of such activities.

With over 45 percent of the students surveyed, returning to college within two years of the time they stopped out of college, institutional efforts to retain and attract sophomore level students must take into consideration the returning student. Any institutional efforts which are trying to increase the number of students

in sophomore level courses should include an effort to attract the stopout student back into college. Additional implications are that the sooner an institution can re-enroll a stopout student, the more likely it is they will be able to continue to meet the student's educational goals and objectives.

Because the findings indicate that intrinsic influences constituted the majority of the top ranked influences, increased institutional commitment to attracting returning students needs to include activities which will lead to a better understanding of intrinsic motivation.

It has been noted that Increased Earning Potential is the second ranked influence (and trigger) causing dropout students to return to college. Since it is an extrinsic factor, increased emphasis on the improved earning potential of college graduates could be a most effective strategy in attracting students back to college. The Desire to Learn and Increased Value on Education are intrinsic factors that could be subtilely promoted in all material targeted toward students and former students. This influence could trigger student decisions to return to college.

Implications for Further Study

Researchers conducting further studies related to student retention and focusing on the phenomenon of returning students, should ask, "What institutional advantages are met by reattracting former students (e.g.

increased enrollment in intermediate and advanced level courses)?" Areas for further research, based on the implications of this study include the following:

1. A variation of this study which would clarify the distinction between the influences and the triggers.

2. Conducting this study at a more ethnically diverse campus to determine if the significance of any variables changes when the minority representation is higher.

3. Determination of the optimum point for intervention during a stopout absence that would cause the stopout student to re-enroll.

4. Administration of the same questionnaire to continuing students to determine if the same influences caused them to stay in college.

5. Determination of which types of employer provided educational assistance improve the return rate of stopout students.

6. Conducting a focused study of returning students to determine why the Value on Education was more frequently cited as the trigger to return to college in the 18 - 27 year age group, and less frequently cited in the 38 and over age group.

7. Investigating what can be done to increase the number of stopout students who return to the technological fields.

8. Determining how many units returning students complete upon returning to college before withdrawing again.

Summary of Conclusions

The stigma of failure which is attached to dropping out of college affects both the student and the institution. This researcher believes the label is premature. This study supports the literature which indicates many more students

continue their college education through non-continuous attendance than is generally believed.

While the profile of returning students in the institution studied was similar to the general student population, this study discovered a window of opportunity of two years within which to optimally attract dropout students back to college. Programs to encourage dropouts to return to college need to accommodate the fact that most stopout students will continue to work forty hours per week and will receive no educational assistance from their employers.

Knowing that the "Desire to Learn", an intrinsic influence, and "Improved Earning Potential", an extrinsic factor, were indicated as the most important influences and triggers to return to college, institutions can gear programs and information to target these influences/triggers and thereby improve graduation rates of dropout students. Institutional efforts to recruit dropout students can be an important factor in improving the pool of human potential and increasing student success.

While the "trigger" influence concept was not documented, valuable information was gained which can be included in any institutional effort to improve student completion rates. The implications for further study are dominated by the need to better identify "triggers to return" and the comparison of influences by ethnicity.

RETURNING TO COLLEGE: WHY NOW?

INTRODUCTION:

This questionnaire is intended to help Riverside Community College identify what influences students to return to college after a period of absence. It is important that you complete this entire questionnaire. The information will assist the college in improving services that encourage students to return and complete their college coursework. Please be assured that complete confidentiality will be maintained.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please record your responses on the questionnaire by filling in the blanks or marking the appropriate boxes. If you have questions or need clarification, please ask the person administering this survey to help you. If a question does not apply to you, simply skip that question and go on to the next question. Feel free to make any written comments on the last page of the questionnaire.

Section One

INFLUENCES and TRIGGERS to RETURN to COLLEGE

INFLUENCES

Directions: Experience has shown that when a person returns to college, there are often several factors that influence their decision. Please rate how the following factors influenced your return to college by circling the appropriate rating number.

1. Was Significant **2**. Had Some Significance **3**. Was Not A Factor.

a.	Marital situation changed	1	2	3
b.	Transportation changed	1	2	3
c.	I place more value on college education	1	2	3

d.	Distance to school changed	1	2	3
e.	Commuting time to work changed	1	2	3
f.	Improved child care	1	2	3
g.	Improved emotional outlook	1	2	3
h.	Parent or family support	1	2	3
i.	Pressure from parents/spouse	1	2	3
j.	Availability of desired major	1	2	3
k.	Improved class scheduling	1	2	3
l.	Occupation requires more college	1	2	3
m.	Changing technology on my job	1	2	3
n.	Dissatisfied with job	1	2	3
o.	Lost job	1	2	3
p.	Availability of six/nine week classes	1	2	3
q.	Receiving college schedule at home	1	2	3
r.	Education will improve earning potential	1	2	3
s.	Desire to continue to learn	1	2	3

If there are other influences not listed that contributed to your return to college at this time, please list them below:

_____

_____

TRIGGERS

Although there are often several factors influencing a person to return to college, the decision to return at a specific time is usually **triggered** by one or two events (factors). This question will be used to identify those **triggers**. Please reread the list of influences above and identify those which caused you to return to college when you did. Mark the corresponding letter in the blanks below.

_____

_____

_____

If there are other factors, not listed, that "**triggered**" your return to college, please list them below.

_____

_____

Section Two

Directions: Fill in the blanks or mark the appropriate box.

Student number: _ _ _ - _ _ - _ _ _ _

1. Sex: [] Male [] Female

2. Age
   - [] 18 - 22
   - [] 23 - 27
   - [] 28 - 32
   - [] 33 - 37
   - [] 38 - 42
   - [] 43 - 47
   - [] 48 - 52
   - [] 53 - 57
   - [] over 57

3. Ethnicity:
   - [] American Indian
   - [] Asian
   - [] Black
   - [] Latino
   - [] White
   - [] Other

4. Have you attended Riverside Community College before this semester?

[] Yes
[] No

5. Student status this semester:

[] Full-time student, 12 or more units
[] Part-time student, 6 - 11 units
[] Part-time student, less than 6 units

6. Current attendance classification:

[] I am primarily a day student
[] I am primarily an evening student
[] I am primarily a week-end student
[] I am both a day and evening student

7. Approximately how many miles do you currently live from the Riverside campus?

[] 5 or fewer
[] 6 - 10
[] 11 - 15
[] 16 - 20
[] 21 - 25
[] 26 - 30
[] over 30

8. Do you have a college degree?

[] No
Yes (if yes, what level?)
[] Associate
[] Baccalaureate
[] Masters

9. How much time has passed from the time you last attended college and your return to college?

[] less than 1 year
[] 1 - 2 years
[] 2 - 3 years
[] 3 - 4 years
[] 4 - 5 years
[] over 5 years

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACT Data File, Compiled from the National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices. "National Drop-out Rate, 1989." 1989.

Agnese, Louis John Jr. "Development, Implementation and Evaluation of a Retention Program at Gannon University." Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1981.

Anding, Kristine M. "Stopping Out, An Emerging Trend." MSU Orient, 1977/78, 13 (Fall/Winter) 10-16 Quoted in Louis Agnese. "Development, Implementation and Evaluation of a Retention Program at Ganon University" 26, Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1981.

Annual Planning Information Riverside-San Bernardino Metropolitan Statistical Area 1988-1989. Sacramento: Employment Development Department. May 1988.

"Assessing the Student Attrition Problem." ERIC Digest. 1984. ERIC, ED 287 522.

Astin, Alexander. Preventing Students from Dropping Out. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. 1977.

Averill, Donald F. Vocational Education Administration and National Priorities. 1982. ERIC, ED 220 129.

Babcock, Robert J. How to Succeed in College: A Guide for the Non-Traditional Student. 1984. ERIC, ED 243 395.

Background Papers to a Prospectus for California Postsecondary Education. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission. March 1985.

Bessire, Jack D. Implications of SLS [Statewide Longitudinal Study] for Student Services (Other than Admissions, Records, Student Information, Counseling, Guidance, and Placement). 1982. ERIC, ED 220 128.

Blanshan, Sue A and Others. Re-entry Student Survey: Office of Women's Services. 1984. ERIC ED 245 613.

Booth, Graham. "The Community College Withdrawer: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Program Reduction Phenomenon." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1987.

Brazziel, Marion E. "Retention Theory and Practice." 1987 University of Connecticut.

Brock, William E. "What Work Requires of Schools." [Preliminary Report.] Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1990.

"Building Communities, A Vision For A New Century." [Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges.] Washington, D.C.: National Center for Higher Education, August, 1988.

California Community Colleges, Research and Analysis Unit, Chancellor's Office. Report on Enrollment Fall 1988. Sacramento, Calif.: California Community Colleges, 1990.

California Data Marketing, Inc. A Lifestyle Segmentation & Analysis of Riverside Community College's Students. Riverside, Calif.: California Data Marketing. 1988.

"California Labor Market Bulletin." Sacramento: Employment Development Department, September 1988.

California Postsecondry Education Commission, A Review of Statewide Long-Range Planning. Sacramento, Calif.: California Postsecondary Education Commission. 1984.

Carbone, John M. Going Back: Adults Talk about What They're Doing in College and How They Feel about Returning to School. 1988. ERIC ED 309 803.

Chickering, Joanne N. Warmline Training Manual: Peer Counseling Adult Students. 1987. ERIC, ED 289 125.

Cohen, Arthur M. Implications of the Statewide Longitudinal Study for the Academic Curriculum/Collegiate Function in California Community Colleges: A Review Paper. April 1982. ERIC, ED 220 124.

Cope, Robert G. and William Hannah. Revolving College Doors: The Causes and Consequences of Dropping Out. New York: John Wiley, 1975.

Cox, James. Basics of Questionnaire Construction in Educational Settings. Downey: Office of Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1983.

David, Larry M. Gaining Faculty and Administrative Support for Student Success Courses. Rapid City, SD: College Survival Inc., 1988.

Dean, Gary J. and Jan P. Eriksen. Academic Counseling for Adults in Transition to High-Tech Careers. 1984. ERIC ED 249 371.

"Demographics By Zip Code." Riverside, Ca: The Press-Enterprise Newspaper, 1987.

Dominici, Margaret L. Comments on the Significance of the Statewide Longitudinal Study. 1982. ERIC, ED 220 120.

Duncan, Roberto. Four Models for Increasing Student Retention at the Community College of Denver. August 1985. ERIC ED 269 106

Eagle, Norman. Survey of Non-Returning Students, Spring 1981. 1982 ERIC, ED 225 422.

Eckland, Bruce K. "College Dropouts Who Come Back," Harvard Educational Review Vol. 30 (1964): 402-20.

"Equity and Excellence: A Promise to the New Majority." Sacramento: Report and Recommendations for Action by Symposium on the Enrollment, Retention and Transfer of Minority Students, October 1986.

Ewing, Nell. "From Dropout to Scholar: Mary King's Transformation." The Community, Technical and Junior College Times. January 17, 1989.

Farnsworth, Danal. "Some Non-Academic Causes of Success and Failure in College Students," College Admissions 2 (1976): 72-78. Quoted in Diane Van Hook. "An Analysis of the Personal, Social and Familial Characteristics Contributing to the Persistence and Withdrawal of Female Community College Students." Ed.D. diss., University of LaVerne, 1981.

Gastright, Joseph F. "Don't Base Your Dropout Program on Somebody Else's Problem." Phi Delta Kappa Research Bulletin. April 1989, 8.

Gay, L.R. Educational Research. 2d ed. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill publishing, 1981.

Gayni, K.F. "Attrition and Graduation Rate Differences Between Commuter Students Admitted to an Urban University in 1970-1974" College & University. Spring 1979. Quoted in Louis Agnese. "Development, Implementation and Evaluation of a Retention Program at Ganon University." Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1981.

Giles, Ray. Meeting the Challenge of a Changing California. Santa Ana, Ca: Chancellor's Office-California Community Colleges, The Learning, Assessment and Retention Consortium, 1988.

Glenny, Lyman A. "Demographic and Related Issues for Higher Education in the 1980's," Journal of Higher Education 51:4 1980.

Goehring, Harvey J. Jr. Statistical Methods in Education. Arlington, Virginia: Information Resources Press, 1981.

Goff, Richard W. Informal Personal Observations of The Statewide Longitudinal Study from a Finance Perspective. 1982. ERIC, ED 220 126

Gold, Ben K. The Statewide Longitudional Study: First Report. Aug. 1979. ERIC, ED 174 287.

Grant, W. Vance and Thomas D. Snyder. Digest of Educational Statistics. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. Government Printing Office, 1987.

Guthrie, James W., Michael Kirst, and Terry S. Emmett, ed. Conditions of Education in California. Berkeley, Calif.: Policy Analysis for California Education, 1985.

Haponski, William C. Recruit and Retain Adult Students. The Challenge of the 80's . . and Beyond: To Create New Faces in your Classrooms and Keep Them There! 1982. ERIC, ED 226 637.

Head, Ronald B. PVCC New Student Profile, Fall Semester 1988. Research Report Number 2-89. 1989. ERIC ED 303 229.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. California: The State and its Educational System. Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Educational Leadership, 1986.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. Guess Who's Coming to College: Your Students in 1990. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, January 1983.

Hunter, Russell and Stephen M. Sheldon. Statewide Longitudinal Study. Report on Academic Year 1978-1979. Part I, Fall Results. 1979. ERIC, ED 180 530.

Hunter, Russell and Stephen Sheldon. Statewide Longitudinal Study. Report on Academic Year 1979-1980. Part III, Fall Results. 1980. ERIC, ED 188 714.

Hunter, Russell and Stephen M. Sheldon. Statewide Longitudinal Study. Report on Academic Year 1979-1980. Part 4, Spring 1980 Results. 1981. ERIC, ED 203 953.

Isaac, Stephen and William Michael. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. 2d ed. San Diego, Calif.: EDITS Publishers, 1985.

Kesselman, Judy R. Stopping Out: A Guide to Leaving College and Getting Back In. New York: M. Evans and Co. 1976.

Kester, Donald L. "California Community College Stopouts: A Comparison of the Three NOR CAL - CCHE Follow-up Studies." Dec. 1971. ERIC, ED 057 771.

Kester, Donald L. The Three Year NorCal Attrition Reduction Study (1968-1970). Downey, Ca.: Los Angeles County Office of Education.

King, George. Conference Report on Minority Attrition and Retention in Higher Education: Strategies for Change. Sacramento: Assembly office of Research, 1987.

Kissler, Gerald. "Trends Affecting Higher Education in California in the 1980's." Los Angeles: UCLA Planning Office, April, 1980.

Kline, Paula. My Turn: A Woman's Guide to Returning to School in the New Haven Area. 1981. ERIC ED 237 738.

Knoell, D.M. et al. Through the open door: A Study of Patterns of Enrollment and Performance in California Community Colleges. Report 76-1, Sacramento, Calif.: CPEC. Quoted in Graham Booth. "The Community College Withdrawer: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Program Reduction Phenomenon." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1987.

Knoell, Dorothy M. Articulation with Secondary, Postsecondary, and Higher Education: One Look at the Statewide Longitudinal Study. 1982. ERIC, ED 220 121.

Lucas, John A. Follow-up Studies of Students Who Have Stopped Out, 1974-1981. 1983. ERIC, JC 830 311.

Mac Millan, Thomas F. The Statewide Longitudinal Study: An Overview of Perspectives and Policy Recommendations. Dec. 1982. ERIC, ED 225 612.

Mac Millan, Thomas F. The Statewide Longitudinal Study: Implications for Accreditation, Evaluation and Educational Accountability. April 1982. ERIC, ED 220 125.

Mac Millan, Thomas F. and Donald M Kester. "Promises to Keep: NOR CAL Impact on Student Attrition" The Community and Junior College Journal Vol 43 No 5. (Feb. 1973): 45-46.

Magaziner, Ira C. America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages! Rochester, New York: National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990.

Mishler, C. "Adults' Perceptions of the Benefits of a College Degree" Research In Higher Education 19 (1983), 213-30.

Morris, Cathy. Coming Back to School: A Profile of Fall Term 1987 Transition Center Students. 1988. ERIC ED 301 307.

Nelson, Fred A. "Independent Higher Education in California." Berkley: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Newman, F. Report on Higher Education (U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare: Office of Education. Washington D.C.: 1971).

Noel, Lee, Randi Levitz, Diana Saluri, and Associates. Increasing Student Retention. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1986.

Norusis, Marija J. SPSS/PC+ Studentware. Chicago: SPSS Inc., 1988.

O'Hanneson, Gregory S. The Value of the Statewide Longitudinal Study for Vocational Education Curriculum. July, 1982. ERIC, ED 220 123.

Ottinger, Cecilia A. Fact Book on Higher Education. Mac Millian, New York. 1988.

Pailthorp, Keith. 50 Views of California Population and Enrollment: A Presentation to The Association of California Couuminty College Administrators. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 1986

Pailthorp, Keith. The Year 2000 and Then Some: A Presentation to the College of Relations Board of The

Northrop Corporation. Sacramento: California Post-secondary Education Commission, April 1987.

Pascarella, Ernest T. Studying Student Attrition. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., December 1982.

Peterson, Richard E. "Goals For California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 Academic Communities." Berkley: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Phillips John L. Jr. Statistical Thinking, A Structural Approach. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1982.

Pokin, Steve. "Black Men on Campus." The Press-Enterprise. 11 March 1990.

Press Enterprise. 1988. 10 January. 9 February. 5, 9 March. 5, 6, 18, May. 2, 8, 29 June. 16, 24, 29 July. 3, 7, 18, 23 August. 1, 7, 15, 18, 25, 27, 29 September. 14, 29 October.

Projections of Employment by Industry and Occupation 1980-1990 - Riverside-SanBernardino Metropolitan Statistical Area. Sacramento: Employment Development Department, October 1986.

A Prospectus For California Postsecondary Education, 1985-2000. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, June 26, 1985.

Quint, Louis. Statewide Longitudinal Study: Implications for Counseling, Guidance and Student Placement. 1982 ERIC, ED 220 127.

Ramist, Leonard. College Student Attrition and Retention. College Board Report No. 81-1, New York, 1981.

Renolds, H.T. Analysis of Nominal Data. 2d ed. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication, 1977.

Riverside, California: Community Data Profile. Riverside, Ca.: Keeping Riverside Ahead, 1988.

"Riverside: 2010." The Southern California Economy Toward the 21st Century. Riverside, Ca,: Wells Fargo Bank.

Rotberg, Iris C. "Resources and Reality: The Participation of Minorities in Science and Engineering Education." Phi Delta Kappan, May 1990, 672-679.

Roueche, John E. "Leadership for 2000" Speech given to the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development College Leadership Conference May, 1990.

Roueche, John E, and George Baker III. Access & Excellence, The Open-Door College. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press, 1987.

Runyon, Richard P., and Audrey Haber. Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. 6th ed. New York: Random House, 1988.

Sandusky, Sam T. Identification of High Risk Students From Matriculation Information. ERIC ED 283 585.

Saxon, David. Speech given when leaving the presidency of the University of California in 1983. Quoted in Harold Hodgkinson. The State and its Educational System, 6 Washington: The Institute for Educational Leadership. 1986.

Sewall, Timothy J. UWC-Baraboo/Sauk County Adult Student Survey Report. 1984. ERIC ED 257 970.

Schlossberg, Nancy K. Counseling Adults in Transition: Linking Practice with Theory. New York: Springer Publishing Co. 1984. Quoted in Gary J. Dean and Jan P Erickson. Academic Counseling for Adults in Transition to High-Tech Careers. 1984. ERIC, ED 249 371.

Sharp, Karen T. Meeting the Challenge: Implications of "Educating Americans for the 21st Century" for Two-Year Colleges. 1984. ERIC ED 248 935.

Sheldon, Stephen M. Research and Educational Decisions: An Editorial. 1983. ERIC, ED 230 217.

Sheldon, Stephen M. and Russell Hunter. Statewide Longitudinal Study, Report on Academic Year 1978-1979. Part II, Spring Results. 1980. ERIC, ED 184 636.

Sheldon, Stephen M. Statewide Longitudinal Study, Report on Academic Year 1978-1981, Part 5: Final Report. 1982. ERIC, ED 217 917.

Sheldon, Stephen M. and Clive L. Crafton. "Summary of Statewide Longitudinal Study", (Report to the California Community College System, Chancellor's Office, 1983), Photocopied.

Smart, John C. and Ernest T. Pascarella. "Influences on the Intention to Reenter Higher Education" Journal of Higher Education Vol. 58, No. 3 (May/June 1987).

Snider, Patricia A. and Patricia L. Valente. Women on Their Way Survival Kit: A Guide for the Woman Entering College. 1984. ERIC ED 247 967.

Spanard, J.M. "Life Change Model." Boston: Conference on Student Retention, 1987.

Stetson, Nancy E. The Effect of Direct Mail and Telephone Contacts on Rate of Return of Students Who Dropped Out. 1984. ERIC, ED 253 286.

Stevenson, Michael R. and R. Dan Walleri, and Saundra M. Japely. "Student Intentions, Follow-up Studies, and Student Tracking" Using Student Tracking Systems Effectively. New Directions for Community Colleges, ed. T. H. Bers, no. 66 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Summer 1989.

Summerskill, John. "Dropouts from College." In The American College, Edited by N. Sanford, 627-658. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

The Cooperative Institutional Research Program. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, 1988.

Thomas, Robert. "Student Retention at Liberal Arts Colleges: The Development and Test of a Model, 1989" TMs [Photocopy]

Tichenor, Richard. Saint Louis Community College Non-Returning Students: Retention Problems or Success Stories? 1987. ERIC, ED 287 551.

Tinto, Vincent. Leaving College. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Tinto, Vincent. "The Principles of Effective Retention". prepared for presentation at the Learning Assessment Retention Consortium of California. Sept. 16, 1988.

Tinto, Vincent. Interview by Dr. Gerald Stars. "What Colleges Can Do To Improve Retention." Teleconference.

Vail, Evan. "Retention Rates for Fall, 1989, by Subject Area, Division, Site, Accounting Method and College-Wide." Riverside, Riverside Community College, June 1990. Typewritten.

Van Hook, Diane Gracia. "An Analysis of the Personal, Social, and Familial Characteristics Contributing to the Persistence and Withdrawal of Female Community College Students." Ed.D. diss., University of LaVerne, 1981.

Walsh, David. Case Study, Retention at Riverside Community College. Boston: Institute for Educational Management, Harvard College, 1990.

Weiss, Henry. Informal Observations on the Longitudinal Study, Basic Support Concerns Affecting the Colleges and the Nature of Programs Offered: The Potential for Problem Resolution Through Collaborative Participation and Alternative Resources. April 1982. ERIC, ED 220 122.

"Why Students Don't Return: A Survey of Nonreturning Students in the San Bernardino Community College District Springs, 1984 to Fall, 1984." San Bernardino, Ca.: Office of Planning and Research, San Bernardino Community College District, 1985. Photocopied.

Wolfgang, M.E. and W.D. Dowling. "Differences in Motivation of Adult and Younger Undergraduates" Journal of Higher Education 52 (November/December 1981).

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

APR 0 3 1992